REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

IDS

Per the Examiner's request, Applicant attaches the original IDS filed on October 12, 2007, to this reply. Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the references cited in the IDS enclosed. Applicant believes no fee is necessary, as the IDS was already filed on 10/12/2010, and the fact that the Examiner could not see the IDS appears to be a PTO uploading error.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-3, 22, 24-26, 40, 41, 43, 44, and 57 are pending. Claims 1, 24, and 43 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 24, and 43.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 24-26, 40, 43, and 44

Claims 1-3, 24-26, 40, 43, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over EP 0746119 A2 ("Kuwabara") in view of U.S. Patent 5,903,816 ("Broadwin") and U.S. Patent No. 5,903,816 ("Dawson"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

MPEP § 2143 states that "[t]he key to supporting any rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 is the clear articulation of the reason(s) why the claimed invention would have been obvious. The Supreme Court in KSR noted that the analysis supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 should be made explicit." Further, when combining prior art elements, the Examiner "must articulate the following: (1) a finding that the prior art included each element claimed, although not necessarily in a single prior art reference, with the only difference between the claimed invention and the prior art being the lack of actual combination of the elements in a single prior art reference...." MPEP § 2143(A).

The independent claims recite, in part, (i) receiving packet data related to the Internet response via the PSTN connection, where the data received contains sufficient information to enable the receiver/decoder to retrieve the Internet response; and (ii) where the Internet response is sent over a satellite link. Thus, in the claimed invention, data received via the slow link (the PSTN connection) is used by the receiver/decoder to obtain the location of where to get the Internet response (the web page) that is sent via the fast link (the earth receiver satellite link). The receiver/decoder then uses the information in the data received via the PSTN to extract the Internet response from the satellite link and provide the Internet response to the user/subscriber. *See* Specification, Figure 13, Step 48 and page 24 of Specification.

The Examiner correctly admits that both Kuwabara and Broadwin fail to disclose or render obvious the aforementioned limitations of the independent claims. *See* Office Action mailed 4/25/10, page 6. However, the Examiner asserts that Dawson discloses the limitation of receiving an internet request via a public switched telephone network connection and sending a data packet, over the PSTN connection, containing information to enable the receiver/decoder to extract the internet response sent over a satellite link. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Specifically, Applicant asserts that the Examiner has misinterpreted the teachings of Dawson. Dawson discloses that *either one of* a sateillite or a PSTN is used to request re-transmission of data packets, but not both, as required by the claimed invention. In Dawson, when more than one headend requires re-transmission of packets receiving in error, the satellite link is used to re-transmit the data packets, so that all headends in question can receive the re-transmitted data packet at once. *See* Dawson, col. 11, ll. 14-19. When only one headend needs to request re-transmission of data packets received in error, the packets are re-transmitted using a PSTN connection, so that the headend can simultaneously receive file data packet stream via satellite and the re-transmitted packets originally received in error via the PSTN. *See* Dawson, col. 11, ll. 19-31. The first scenario doesn't apply to the claimed invention, because only the satellite link is used to sent re-transmitted packets, and there is no need for a PSTN connection to be involved. Applicant asserts that the second scenario also fails to disclose or render obvious the claimed limitation, because where a single head-end is receiving simultaneously from both a satellite and a PSTN, the re-transmitted packets sent via the PSTN do not enable the receiver/decode to *extract an internet response* sent over the satellite link. In fact, in Dawson, the PSTN is used only for re-transmission of the original data packets received in error, and **not** for sending data packets containing information to enable extraction (*e.g.,* by including a location of the satellite link port) of an *Internet response* sent over the satellite link. In the simultaneous scenario of Dawson, the re-transmitted packets have nothing to do with the data coming in via the satellite link. There are merely packets that need to be re-sent because there were sent in error over the satellite link originally. That is, there is no link between the re-transmitted packets and those coming in on the satellite link, except that they are part of the same file data stream. Certainly, there is no connection that requires using the re-transmitted packets sent via the PSTN to extract what is coming in on the satellite link – rather, these are two parallel paths that occur simultaneously in Dawson, which is precisely the opposite of what is required by the claimed invention, as the claimed invention requires that the packets obtained over the PSTN are subsequently used to get the Internet response sent over the satellite link. Accordingly, Dawson clearly fails to disclose that the PSTN is used to send packets that enable extraction of an Internet response sent over a satellite link. Thus, Dawson fails to disclose or render obvious (i) and (ii) as required above.

Moreover, not only are the data packets sent over PSTN not used to obtain the packets sent over the satellite link, Applicant asserts that it is not even possible for Dawson to disclose or render obvious the limitations required by (i) and (ii) above because Dawson is not directed to using/browsing the Interent via a broadcast television system. In fact, it is not possible for Dawson to disclose or suggest anything about extraction of an Internet response, because Dawson is silent with respect to browsing the Internet and receiving responses from the Internet. Rather, Dawson is only focused on transmitting video/audio files from a central location to a plurality of cable headends. *See* Dawson, Abstract. There is absolutely no disclosure of using the Internet via a broadcast system or obtaining responses from the Internet in Dawson. However, the claimed invention requires that the data packets sent over the PSTN connection be used to extract an Internet response sent over a satellite connection. Clearly, Dawson fails to disclose or render obvious such as Internet response, such as a web page sent over a satellite link. Accordingly, for this additional reason, Dawson fails to disclose or render obvious (i) and (ii).

In view of the above, it is clear that the Examiner's contentions fail to support an obviousness rejection of the independent claims. Pending dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 22, 41, and 57

Claims 22, 41, and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Kuwabara in view of Broadwin, Dawson, and further in view of US Pat. No. 5,959,659 ("Dokic"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, Kuwabara, Broadwin, and Dawson, fail to disclose or render obvious the limitations required by (i) and (ii) above. Further, Dokic fails to supply that which Kuwabara, Broadwin, and Dawson, lack.

Specifically, Dokic relates to an MPEG-2 transport stream decoder. Dokic merely discloses sending other data in a private section of an MPEG data stream. However, Dokic is silent with respect to sending an Internet response over a satellite link, and sending information to extract that Internet response over a slower, PSTN link, as required by (i) and (ii) above.

Accordingly, it is clear that Kuwabara, Broadwin, Dawson, and Dokic, whether viewed separately or in combination, fail to disclose or render obvious the limitations recited in the independent claims. Dependent claims 22, 41, and 57 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 11345/110001).

Dated: April 21, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By

Jonathan P. Osha
Registration No.: 33,986
OSHA · LIANG LLP
909 Fannin Street, Suite 3500
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant

Attachment (IDS originally filed on 10/12/07)